

LAW OFFICE OF
BENJAMIN SILVERMAN
224 WEST 30TH ST., SUITE 302
NEW YORK, NY 10001

TEL (212) 203-8074
FAX (646) 843-3938
Benjamin@bsilvermanlaw.com

December 2, 2021

By ECF

Honorable Paul G. Gardephe
United States District Judge
Southern District of New York
40 Foley Square
New York, NY 10007

Re: *United States v. Michael Avenatti*, 19 Cr. 373 (PGG)

Your Honor:

On August 24, 2021, after almost six weeks of trial against Michael Avenatti, the Honorable James V. Selna of the United States District Court for the Central District of California (CDCA) found a “*Brady* violation with respect to a very important range of documents relating to the financial affairs of Mr. Avenatti’s firm” and declared a mistrial. 10/15/21 Transcript, *United States v. Avenatti*, 19 Cr. 61 (JVS) (C.D.C.A. Oct. 15, 2021), Dkt. 867 at 4. We have since discovered a similar *Brady* violation in this case, one that altered the outcome of the trial and requires a new one.

The government argued throughout the trial – in its opening and both summations, and through its witness examinations – that Mr. Avenatti was in “desperate” financial condition and that “facing a mountain of debts, [he] saw a light at the end of the tunnel.” Trial Transcript (T.) 2127. This supposed “desperation” was a cornerstone of the government’s case to establish Mr. Avenatti’s motive and intent to extort and defraud.

Yet, at the same time, the government suppressed analyses by an expert, Mr. John Drum, who it had paid over \$600,000, and who concluded (1) that Mr. Avenatti owned and ran a law practice that received hundreds of millions of dollars from 2009-2018 and generated millions of dollars in annual revenues, a practice that Drum described as “a profitable business with large Net Flows” and (2) Mr. Avenatti enjoyed financial circumstances that were far from “desperate.” *See* Ex. A (Drum Reports excerpts) at

Hon. Paul G. Gardephe
December 2, 2021
Page 2

1144299, 1144320.¹ The government first revealed these analyses in October 2021 – eighteen months after the verdict was returned in this case, three months after Mr. Avenatti was sentenced, and six weeks after the government’s suppression of Brady material led to the mistrial in California.

The suppressed materials powerfully undercut the government’s trial theory that Mr. Avenatti acted with intent to extort and defraud. While it told the jury over and over that Mr. Avenatti was “desperate” and had no other way out, it withheld its expert’s contrary opinion that Mr. Avenatti’s practice was profitable and generated positive cash flow, meaning that he would have been able to generate the cash required to manage his debts without a penny from Nike; thus, the \$12 million debt, while appreciable, was manageable given the millions in positive net flows that his firm consistently generated.² There is no question that these analyses – directly contradicting the government’s trial theory about Mr. Avenatti’s motive and intent – are *Brady* that should have been disclosed before the trial.

We therefore respectfully move for an indicative ruling under Rules 33 and 37(a) addressing the *Brady* violation and informing the Second Circuit that a new trial is necessary. Although Mr. Avenatti’s case is presently on direct appeal, which ordinarily precludes the Court from addressing a Rule 33 motion, *see* Fed. R. Crim. P. 33(b)(1), the Court is empowered under Rule 37 to assist the Second Circuit by providing an indicative ruling addressing how it would rule if the case were to be remanded. For the reasons set forth herein, the *Brady* violation warrants a new trial and an indicative ruling is appropriate.

¹ The Drum Reports are filed under seal because the government has designated them as “Sensitive” under the governing protective order. We see no reason why Mr. Avenatti should be disallowed from publicly filing the government’s analyses of his own finances, but we nonetheless respectfully file the Drum Reports under seal to comply with the government’s designation.

² Included among the materials were spreadsheets showing Mr. Avenatti’s firm received over \$250 million during the years 2011 to 2018, with some years totaling more than \$40 million in cash inflow. Ex. A at 1144346-1144353, 114420-114427.

Hon. Paul G. Gardephe
December 2, 2021
Page 3

I. John Drum was retained by the government in February 2019. His relevant analyses were sent to prosecutors on a rolling basis throughout 2019, but they were suppressed until two months ago.

The government retained John Drum in February 2019 to examine Mr. Avenatti's and his firms' finances.³ It ultimately paid him over \$640,000 for his reports and analyses. Ex. B (8/12 transcript excerpts) at 52-53. Drum produced detailed charts and graphs that he provided to the government in 2019, well in advance of this case's January and February 2020 trial. The government did not, however, even disclose that it retained Drum until March 1, 2020, two weeks after it secured Mr. Avenatti's conviction in this case. And that disclosure was in the California case, not this one.

Drum ultimately testified for the government at Mr. Avenatti's July/August 2021 trial in CDCA. Under cross-examination, he disclosed for the first time that he had over two years of written communications between him and the government that had not been produced as required. *See* Motion for Mistrial, *United States v. Avenatti*, No. 19 Cr. 61 (JVS) (C.D.C.A. Aug. 14, 2021), Dkt. 705 at 4-5. When Mr. Avenatti raised this matter to the Court, the government claimed – falsely – that it had “virtually nothing” in its files from Drum, while simultaneously asserting that his materials were protected by the work product doctrine even though the Supreme Court established 45 years before that work product must be produced if it is covered by the Jencks Act, *Goldberg v. United States*, 425 U.S. 94 (1976). Ex. C (8/13 transcript excerpts) at 5. Mr. Avenatti, in turn, filed a motion to strike the Drum testimony and for a mistrial. *See* Motion for Mistrial, *United States v. Avenatti*, No. 19 Cr. 61 (JVS) (C.D.C.A. Aug. 14, 2021), Dkt. 705 at 4-5.

On August 15, the government filed 389 pages of undisclosed Drum documents for *in camera* review. *See* Ex. D. The next day, the defense received an email from a government lawyer stating: “Per the Court’s order this afternoon, please see attached our *in camera* filing from this weekend. The Court directed us to file this under seal, which we will be doing shortly, and provide a copy to defendant.” *Id.* The production contained hundreds of pages of undisclosed *Brady* and Jencks Act material. The court then deferred

³ The Court has held that the United States Attorney’s Offices in the Southern District of New York (SDNY) and the Central District of California (CDCA) were jointly prosecuting Mr. Avenatti at least as to a witness testifying about Mr. Avenatti’s finances. *United States v. Avenatti*, 2021 WL 2809919, at *44-45 (S.D.N.Y. July 6, 2021). “The government” is therefore used to describe both offices of the Department of Justice.

Hon. Paul G. Gardephe
December 2, 2021
Page 4

ruling on the mistrial motion pending the government's opposition.

On August 24, the court granted a different mistrial motion relating to the government's failure to produce other financial information relating to Mr. Avenatti's firm, finding "a Brady violation with respect to a very important range of documents relating to the financial affairs of Mr. Avenatti's firm." 10/15/21 Transcript, *United States v. Avenatti*, 19 Cr. 61 (JVS) (C.D.C.A. Oct. 15, 2021), Dkt. 867 at 4 (attached hereto as Exhibit F). During the hearing, the court found that Mr. Avenatti suffered substantial prejudice due to the government's suppression of evidence:

I find that prejudice occurred here in a number of ways. I think the defendant was denied an opportunity to craft his overall theory of the case and presentation, including the opening statement, by not having this additional material. I believe that the defense was prejudiced in its ability to cross-examine certain witnesses, in particular, Mr. Drum.

At page 5 of his most recent report at Docket 775, Mr. Avenatti outlines a number of things that he could have done had he had the Tabs information, including cross-examination of certain witnesses, ability to question the government's preparation techniques generally, and so on. I won't repeat those.

Ex. E (8/24 transcript excerpts) at 62-63.

In October, following repeated demands by Mr. Avenatti and failures by the government to produce additional Drum materials, the government finally acquiesced and produced the Drum Reports – an additional 443 pages of information, including charts and tables that Drum created for the government throughout 2019. The previously unproduced documents include charts illustrating Mr. Avenatti's substantial net positive cash flow from 2009-2018, which often times was many millions per year, leading Drum to conclude as of September 4, 2019 – four months before this case's trial – that Mr. Avenatti's firm "is a profitable business, with large Net Flows . . ." Ex. A at 1144299.

II. The Drum Reports reveal Mr. Avenatti's access to enormous cash flow.

The Drum Reports include charts illustrating that Mr. Avenatti's firm, Eagan Avenatti LLP (EA), netted over \$75 million in the five years before Mr. Avenatti was arrested and that almost all of that money was transferred either to Mr. Avenatti

Hon. Paul G. Gardephe
December 2, 2021
Page 5

personally or to entities under his direct control.⁴ Ex. A at 1144299, 1144399. One chart illustrates that EA had net cash flow of over \$20 million annually from 2016 through 2018.

III. The Drum Reports undercut the government's trial argument about Mr. Avenatti's motive and intent.

The Drum Reports contradict the government's core argument to the jury in this case that Mr. Avenatti acted with intent to extort and defraud. The government argued that Mr. Avenatti had to extort Nike because he was mired in debt, desperately seeking \$12 million to cover expenses, with no way out. T. 2166. It told the jury during its opening that Mr. Avenatti extorted and defrauded others because "the scheme stood to make him the very millions he needed." T. 151 The government claimed the jury would "learn how desperate the defendant was for money at the time he committed these offenses" because of "the debts the defendant owed, many millions of dollars." T. 153.

It told the jury in summation that Mr. Avenatti was "[d]esperately in need of money," in "desperate times" and therefore approached Nike "to line his pockets." T. 2180, 2186-2187. It made this a centerpiece of its summation, telling the jury:

And that is why we are here today. Because Michael Avenatti, facing a mountain of debts, saw a light at the end of the tunnel.

T. 2127

It then argued in its rebuttal summation that Mr. Avenatti faced "desperate times" and was "desperately in need of money – and, by the way that's undisputed." T. 2280, 2286-2287.

But it knew that the undisclosed Drum Reports indicated just the opposite – that Mr. Avenatti's practice had a history of positive cash flow, thus easily enabling him to manage these debts and establishing a state of mind consistent with this fact.

The government similarly argued in an *in limine* motion that if Mr. Avenatti were

⁴ At all relevant times, Mr. Avenatti owned between 75-100% of his law practice and generated nearly all of the firm's business and revenues. EA was an established firm co-founded in 2007.

Hon. Paul G. Gardephe
December 2, 2021
Page 6

to testify, cross examination about his finances would be vital to proving his criminal intent:

[I]t is notable that, to date, the defendant has repeatedly – and falsely – suggested to the jury, through the cross-examination of others, that at the relevant time, he had easy access to substantial sums of money. . . . [I]t is an entirely proper subject for cross-examination, including with respect to contemporaneous debts not in evidence, because these facts rebut any suggestion of an innocent explanation for the defendant’s conduct.

Dkt. 252 at 3. Yet while the government derided as “false” Mr. Avenatti’s claims that he was able to manage his debts and claimed that Mr. Avenatti had no other way out, it suppressed its own expert’s reports and graphs concluding that Mr. Avenatti’s practice generated enormous annual cash flow sufficient to manage even \$12 million in debts.

The Court was persuaded by the government’s argument and, accordingly, ruled that Mr. Avenatti could be cross examined about his finances if he testified:

[E]vidence of Mr. Avenatti’s desperate financial condition – the more than \$11 million in debt he had accrued in the months immediately preceding March 2019 – is relevant to his motive for committing the charged offenses. As I have ruled multiple times, evidence of Mr. Avenatti’s desperate financial condition – the more than \$11 million in debt he had accrued in the months immediately preceding March 2019 – is relevant to his motive for committing the charged offenses. Indeed, the testimony of his office manager – Judy Regnier – indicates that in [a] conversation with her, Mr. Avenatti linked his allegedly criminal activity in March 2019 with his desire to “clear the decks” of his debt.

T. 1821-1822 (internal citations omitted). At the same time the government persuaded the Court that Mr. Avenatti’s situation was “desperate” – implying that his debts were substantially greater than he could reasonably be expected to repay or manage – it kept to itself Drum’s \$640,000 charts and analyses revealing just the opposite.

The Drum Reports do not minimize Mr. Avenatti’s debts; but they make clear that the cash flow that he received from his law practice prior to his indictments was

Hon. Paul G. Gardephe
 December 2, 2021
 Page 7

sufficient to manage them and that Mr. Avenatti was hardly in “desperate” shape or lacking means to pay his debts without extorting or defrauding Nike. Drum’s analyses undermine the cornerstone of the government’s argument about Mr. Avenatti’s motive and intent when he approached Nike.

IV. The Court should issue an indicative ruling providing that a new trial would be ordered under Rule 33 if this case is remanded.

A. The remedy for material *Brady* violations is a new trial.

“The government has a duty to disclose evidence favorable to the accused when it is material to guilt or punishment.” *United States v. Avenatti*, 2021 WL 2809919, at *41 (S.D.N.Y. July 6, 2021) (Gardephe, J.) (quoting *United States v. Madori*, 419 F.3d 159, 169 (2d Cir. 2005)). A new trial should be granted under Rule 33 when the government violates *Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83, 87 (1963) where (1) the government engaged in “suppression” of evidence that (2) is favorable to defendant and (3) the evidence is material. *Moore v. Illinois*, 408 U.S. 786, 794–95 (1972); *United States v. Payne*, 63 F.3d 1200, 1208 (2d Cir.1995). The government has an affirmative duty to disclose exculpatory evidence known to it even absent a specific request. *United States v. Agurs*, 427 U.S. 97, 108–110 (1976); *United States v. Bagley*, 473 U.S. 667, 682 (1985).). A Rule 33 motion is appropriate in “the most extraordinary cases,” *United States v. Ferguson*, 246 F.3d 129, 134 (2d Cir. 2001), like the instant one in which the government suppressed expert analyses directly undercutting its jury argument.

B. The Court is empowered to issue an indicative, or advisory, ruling while the appeal is pending.

Generally, a Rule 33 motion cannot be granted while an appeal is pending. Fed. R. App. P. 33(b)(1). Rule 37, however, provides that “[i]f a timely motion is made for relief that the court lacks authority to grant because of an appeal that has been docketed and is pending, the court may: (1) defer considering the motion; (2) deny the motion; or (3) state either that it would grant the motion if the court of appeals remands for that purpose or that the motion raises a substantial issue.” Fed. R. Crim. P. 37(a).⁵

⁵ Even absent an indicative ruling, the Rule 33 motion needs to be filed at this time to be entered within three years of the verdict and therefore timely under Fed R. Crim. P. 33(b)(1).

Hon. Paul G. Gardephe
December 2, 2021
Page 8

C. The government suppressed material *Brady* documents and a new trial is necessary.

The government suppressed expert analyses that would have pulled the rug out from underneath its trial argument about Mr. Avenatti's state of mind – his motive and intent. The Drum Reports were emailed to government lawyers in May and September 2019 – well in advance of the 2020 trial in this case. Ex. A at 1144299, 1144399. Yet the government did not disclose them until after Mr. Avenatti was sentenced. In the interim, it made trial arguments that were directly contradicted by the undisclosed analyses. It argued to the jury that Mr. Avenatti was in a “desperate” situation because his debt was so large; but the undisclosed Drum Reports reveal that Mr. Avenatti regularly had access to huge sums of positive cash flow. The suppressed evidence is clearly favorable to the defense: it powerfully undercuts the government's argument about Mr. Avenatti's intent and state of mind when he approached Nike.

Critical charts were emailed to Assistant United States Attorney Julian Andre on May 16, 2019 – seven months before the trial in this case began. Ex. A at 1144272. Other charts were sent to Andre and AUSA Brett Sagel on November 4, 2019. *Id.* at 1144388. Both AUSAs are at the center of the *Brady* violation in California and they were at Saint Andrew's Plaza working on witness prep during the trial in this case and seated at times in the courtroom; they were firmly within the government's trial team. Yet the government told the Court at that time, in the middle of the trial, that Mr. Avenatti lacked “easy access to substantial sums of money.” Dkt. 252 at 3. It argued to the jury that his conduct should be viewed through a skeptical lens because he acted out of desperation without any other way to pay his debts. T. 151, 2180, 2186-2187. It knew when making these arguments that its own expert had concluded the opposite was true, but it did not disclose that analysis – a plain *Brady* violation. *See United States v. Avellino*, 136 F.3d 249, 255 (2d Cir. 1998) (a prosecutor is “presumed . . . to have knowledge of all information gathered in connection with his office's investigation of the case and indeed has a duty to learn of any favorable evidence known to others acting on the government's behalf in the case.”) (internal quotation marks omitted).

The government did not even provide notice that it had retained Drum until after the trial, even though he had been forwarding his analyses to the government throughout the discovery period in this case. There is therefore no way that counsel could have requested these materials or gained them through due diligence – the defense did not even know that Drum existed until after the trial was over and had no inkling about his

Hon. Paul G. Gardephe
December 2, 2021
Page 9

conclusions about Mr. Avenatti's positive cash flow until after sentence was imposed in July and after the mistrial was declared in the CDCA case in August. *See United States v. Alessi*, 638 F.2d 466, 479 (2d Cir. 1980).

The suppressed evidence is material because it "creates a reasonable doubt that did not otherwise exist." *United States v. Agurs*, 427 U.S. 97, 112 (1976). The government told the jury that Mr. Avenatti's "desperate" situation proved that he acted with criminal intent. T. 151, 2280, 2286-87. It told the Court that evidence that he could not repay his debts was foundational to its proof of intent because it "rebut[ted] any suggestion of an innocent explanation for the defendant's conduct." Dkt 252 at 3. It was a cornerstone of the government's case. Undermining this argument using the government's own \$640,000 expert analyses and charts would have been powerful and created strong doubts that were not before the jury. Thus, "there is a reasonable probability that, had the evidence been disclosed to the defense, the result of the [trial] would have been different." *Kyles v. Whitley*, 514 U.S. 419, 433-34 (1995).⁶

Moreover, the suppressed evidence affected Mr. Avenatti's decision to testify. The government won an *in limine* ruling permitting cross examination about his financial situation. T. 1821-1822. This would have permitted the government to use their warped presentation of his finances against him at the same time that it withheld information showing the opposite. New trials are necessary when suppressed documents affect a defendant's decision to testify. *United States v. Thomas*, 239 F.3d 163, 168 (2d Cir. 2001) (new trial ordered where government withheld impeachment document until after defendant took the stand); *United States v. Lam Lek Chong*, 544 F.2d 58, 69 (2d Cir. 1976) (new trial unnecessary because defendant could not show that suppressed evidence affected decision to testify).

⁶ The Supreme Court holds that the materiality test is not a matter of sufficiency and a defendant is not required to show "that after discounting the inculpatory evidence in light of the undisclosed evidence, there would not have been enough left to convict." *Id.* at 434-35.

Hon. Paul G. Gardephe
December 2, 2021
Page 10

V. The Court should re-affirm its *Brady* Order.

The government's Drum disclosures two months ago demonstrate that it remained in substantial non-compliance with its *Brady* obligations well after this Court's October 30, 2020 *Brady* Order (Dkt. 305) and even after this Court opined that the SDNY and CDCA prosecutors "are components of the same agency – the U.S. Department of Justice" who "engaged in joint and coordinated fact gathering . . . at least as to" a witness called to testify about Mr. Avenatti's finances. *Avenatti*, 2021 WL 2809919, at *45. We of course do not know what other *Brady* material the government possesses but has failed to produce. We therefore respectfully request that the Court re-issue its *Brady* order and admonish the government to comply with its obligations promptly.

VI. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the Court should issue an indicative ruling that a new trial would be ordered if the case is remanded from the Second Circuit.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Benjamin Silverman

Benjamin Silverman

Attorney for Michael Avenatti

cc: Counsel of record (by ECF)

Exhibit A

REDACTED

Exhibit B

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA - SOUTHERN DIVISION
3 HONORABLE JAMES V. SELNA, U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE
4

5 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)
6 Plaintiff,) **CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT**
7 vs.) Case No.
8) SACR-19-00061-JVS
9 MICHAEL JOHN AVENATTI,) **PUBLIC VERSION**
10 Defendant.) **TRIAL DAY 19**
11 **VOLUME 2**
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23
24 REPORTER'S PARTIAL TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
25 THURSDAY, AUGUST 12, 2021
1:25 P.M.
SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA

26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000
1001
1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026
1027
1028
1029
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1150
1151
1152
1153
1154
1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176
1177
1178
1179
1180
1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1189
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1200
1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207
1208
1209
1210
1211
1212
1213
1214
1215
1216
1217
1218
1219
1220
1221
1222
1223
1224
1225
1226
1227
1228
1229
1230
1231
1232
1233
1234
1235
1236
1237
1238
1239
1240
1241
1242
1243
1244
1245
1246
1247
1248
1249
1250
1251
1252
1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258
1259
1260
1261
1262
1263
1264
1265
1266
1267
1268
1269
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277
1278
1279
1280
1281
1282
1283
1284
1285
1286
1287
1288
1289
1290
1291
1292
1293
1294
1295
1296
1297
1298
1299
1300
1301
1302
1303
1304
1305
1306
1307
1308
1309
1310
1311
1312
1313
1314
1315
1316
1317
1318
1319
1320
1321
1322
1323
1324
1325
1326
1327
1328
1329
1330
1331
1332
1333
1334
1335
1336
1337
1338
1339
1340
1341
1342
1343
1344
1345
1346
1347
1348
1349
1350
1351
1352
1353
1354
1355
1356
1357
1358
1359
1360
1361
1362
1363
1364
1365
1366
1367
1368
1369
1370
1371
1372
1373
1374
1375
1376
1377
1378
1379
1380
1381
1382
1383
1384
1385
1386
1387
1388
1389
1390
1391
1392
1393
1394
1395
1396
1397
1398
1399
1400
1401
1402
1403
1404
1405
1406
1407
1408
1409
1410
1411
1412
1413
1414
1415
1416
1417
1418
1419
1420
1421
1422
1423
1424
1425
1426
1427
1428
1429
1430
1431
1432
1433
1434
1435
1436
1437
1438
1439
1440
1441
1442
1443
1444
1445
1446
1447
1448
1449
1450
1451
1452
1453
1454
1455
1456
1457
1458
1459
1460
1461
1462
1463
1464
1465
1466
1467
1468
1469
1470
1471
1472
1473
1474
1475
1476
1477
1478
1479
1480
1481
1482
1483
1484
1485
1486
1487
1488
1489
1490
1491
1492
1493
1494
1495
1496
1497
1498
1499
1500
1501
1502
1503
1504
1505
1506
1507
1508
1509
1510
1511
1512
1513
1514
1515
1516
1517
1518
1519
1520
1521
1522
1523
1524
1525
1526
1527
1528
1529
1530
1531
1532
1533
1534
1535
1536
1537
1538
1539
1540
1541
1542
1543
1544
1545
1546
1547
1548
1549
1550
1551
1552
1553
1554
1555
1556
1557
1558
1559
1560
1561
1562
1563
1564
1565
1566
1567
1568
1569
1570
1571
1572
1573
1574
1575
1576
1577
1578
1579
1580
1581
1582
1583
1584
1585
1586
1587
1588
1589
1590
1591
1592
1593
1594
1595
1596
1597
1598
1599
1600
1601
1602
1603
1604
1605
1606
1607
1608
1609
1610
1611
1612
1613
1614
1615
1616
1617
1618
1619
1620
1621
1622
1623
1624
1625
1626
1627
1628
1629
1630
1631
1632
1633
1634
1635
1636
1637
1638
1639
1640
1641
1642
1643
1644
1645
1646
1647
1648
1649
1650
1651
1652
1653
1654
1655
1656
1657
1658
1659
1660
1661
1662
1663
1664
1665
1666
1667
1668
1669
1670
1671
1672
1673
1674
1675
1676
1677
1678
1679
1680
1681
1682
1683
1684
1685
1686
1687
1688
1689
1690
1691
1692
1693
1694
1695
1696
1697
1698
1699
1700
1701
1702
1703
1704
1705
1706
1707
1708
1709
1710
1711
1712
1713
1714
1715
1716
1717
1718
1719
1720
1721
1722
1723
1724
1725
1726
1727
1728
1729
1730
1731
1732
1733
1734
1735
1736
1737
1738
1739
1740
1741
1742
1743
1744
1745
1746
1747
1748
1749
1750
1751
1752
1753
1754
1755
1756
1757
1758
1759
1760
1761
1762
1763
1764
1765
1766
1767
1768
1769
1770
1771
1772
1773
1774
1775
1776
1777
1778
1779
1780
1781
1782
1783
1784
1785
1786
1787
1788
1789
1790
1791
1792
1793
1794
1795
1796
1797
1798
1799
1800
1801
1802
1803
1804
1805
1806
1807
1808
1809
1810
1811
1812
1813
1814
1815
1816
1817
1818
1819
1820
1821
1822
1823
1824
1825
1826
1827
1828
1829
1830
1831
1832
1833
1834
1835
1836
1837
1838
1839
1840
1841
1842
1843
1844
1845
1846
1847
1848
1849
1850
1851
1852
1853
1854
1855
1856
1857
1858
1859
1860
1861
1862
1863
1864
1865
1866
1867
1868
1869
1870
1871
1872
1873
1874
1875
1876
1877
1878
1879
1880
1881
1882
1883
1884
1885
1886
1887
1888
1889
1890
1891
1892
1893
1894
1895
1896
1897
1898
1899
1900
1901
1902
1903
1904
1905
1906
1907
1908
1909
1910
1911
1912
1913
1914
1915
1916
1917
1918
1919
1920
1921
1922
1923
1924
1925
1926
1927
1928
1929
1930
1931
1932
1933
1934
1935
1936
1937
1938
1939
1940
1941
1942
1943
1944
1945
1946
1947
1948
1949
1950
1951
1952
1953
1954
1955
1956
1957
1958
1959
1960
1961
1962
1963
1964
1965
1966
1967
1968
1969
1970
1971
1972
1973
1974
1975
1976
1977
1978
1979
1980
1981
1982
1983
1984
1985
1986
1987
1988
1989
1990
1991
1992
1993
1994
1995
1996
1997
1998
1999
2000
2001
2002
2003
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
2015
2016
2017
2018
2019
2020
2021
2022
2023
2024
2025
2026
2027
2028
2029
2030
2031
2032
2033
2034
2035
2036
2037
2038
2039
2040
2041
2042
2043
2044
2045
2046
2047
2048
2049
2050
2051
2052
2053
2054
2055
2056
2057
2058
2059
2060
2061
2062
2063
2064
2065
2066
2067
2068
2069
2070
2071
2072
2073
2074
2075
2076
2077
2078
2079
2080
2081
2082
2083
2084
2085
2086
2087
2088
2089
2090
2091
2092
2093
2094
2095
2096
2097
2098
2099
2100
2101
2102
2103
2104
2105
2106
2107
2108
2109
2110
2111
2112
2113
2114
2115
2116
2117
2118
2119
2120
2121
2122
2123
2124
2125
2126
2127
2128
2129
2130
2131
2132
2133
2134
2135
2136
2137
2138
2139
2140
2141
2142
2143
2144
2145
2146
2147
2148
2149
2150
2151
2152
2153
2154
2155
2156
2157
2158
2159
2160
2161
2162
2163
2164
2165
2166
2167
2168
2169
2170
2171
2172
2173
2174
2175
2176
2177
2178
2179
2180
2181
2182

APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:

FOR THE PLAINTIFF:

NICOLA T. HANNA
United States Attorney
BY: BRETT SAGEL
Assistant United States Attorney
411 West 4th Street
Suite 8000
Santa Ana, California 92701
714-338-3598
brett.sagel@usdoj.gov

NICOLA T. HANNA
United States Attorney
BY: ALEXANDER WYMAN
Assistant United States Attorney
312 North Spring Street
Suite 1100
Los Angeles, California 90012
213-894-2435
alex.wyman@usdoj.gov

FOR THE DEFENDANT IN PRO SE:

MICHAEL JOHN AVENATTI, ESQ.

STANDBY COUNSEL FOR MR. AVENATTI:

H. DEAN STEWARD LAW OFFICES
BY: H. DEAN STEWARD, ESQ.
17 Corporate Plaza
Suite 254
Newport Beach, California 92660
949-481-4900
deansteward7777@gmail.com

I N D E X

WITNESSES	PAGE
MICHELLE PHAN, CALLED BY THE GOVERNMENT	
Cross-Examination by Mr. Avenatti (resumed)	10
Redirect Examination by Mr. Sagel	18
Recross-Examination by Mr. Avenatti	22
GEFFREY CLARK, CALLED BY THE GOVERNMENT	
Direct Examination by Mr. Wyman	24
Cross-Examination by Mr. Avenatti	31
Redirect Examination by Mr. Wyman	37
Recross-Examination by Mr. Avenatti	37
ROBERTO AMENTA, CALLED BY THE GOVERNMENT	
Direct Examination by Mr. Wyman	39
Cross-Examination by Mr. Avenatti	42
JOHN DRUM, CALLED BY THE GOVERNMENT	
Direct Examination by Mr. Wyman	49

EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT	IN EVIDENCE	WITHDRAWN OR REJECTED
457 Summary Exhibit of Wire Transfers in Indictment	28	
420-450 Summary Financial Tracing Analysis documents	56	
456 Summary Financial Tracing Analysis	56	
384 Statements - EA 2851 - 1.30.2015-3.30.2015	58	

1 You did not have any knowledge of any evidence as to
2 whether these ten wire transfers constitute any crime. Am I
3 correct about that?

4 A Correct.

02:37PM 5 Q You don't know one way or the other; is that right?

6 A Correct.

7 THE REPORTER: I'm sorry, can you get closer to the
8 mic, please.

9 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Correct. My apologies.

02:38PM 10 Q BY MR. AVENATTI: You were simply asked to confirm that
11 the ten transfers went through the Fedwire system. Do I have
12 that correct?

13 A That's right.

14 MR. AVENATTI: One moment, Your Honor.

02:38PM 15 Nothing further, Your Honor. Thank you.

16 MR. WYMAN: No further questions.

17 THE COURT: May the witness be excused?

18 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

19 THE COURT: No, I'm not asking you. Hang on a
02:38PM 20 second.

21 May the witness be excused?

22 MR. AVENATTI: Your Honor, I'm going to reserve the
23 right to recall him, actually.

24 THE COURT: Sir, you're excused for now but you're
02:38PM 25 subject to recall.

1 THE WITNESS: Okay.

2 THE COURT: Thank you. You may step down.

3 MR. WYMAN: Your Honor, the United States calls John
4 Drum.

02:39PM 5 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: If you can stand behind the
6 court reporter and raise your right hand.

7 **JOHN DRUM, GOVERNMENT WITNESS, WAS SWORN**

8 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: If you'll please state and
9 spell your first and last name.

02:40PM 10 THE WITNESS: My name is John Drum, J-o-h-n,
11 D-r-u-m.

12 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Thank you.

13 THE COURT: Mr. Wyman.

14 MR. WYMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

02:40PM 15 **DIRECT EXAMINATION**

16 BY MR. WYMAN:

17 Q Good afternoon, Mr. Drum. Where do you work?

18 A I work for Analysis Group.

19 Q What is Analysis Group?

02:40PM 20 A Analysis Group is an economic consulting company. They
21 perform financial analyses in various settings.

22 Q What is your title at Analysis Group?

23 A Vice president.

24 Q As vice president, what are your general job
02:40PM 25 responsibilities?

1 A I oversee financial analyses primarily in some sort of
2 dispute setting.

3 Q Are you regularly hired to conduct financial analysis in
4 connection with litigation?

02:41PM 5 A Yes.

6 Q Let's discuss your background and financial analysis.
7 Starting with your educational background, where did you attend
8 college?

9 A I received undergraduate and graduate degrees from the
02:41PM 10 Ohio State University.

11 Q And what degrees did you receive?

12 A Bachelor of Science in Accounting and Finance, and a
13 Master of Accounting.

14 Q After you received those degrees, did you obtain any
02:41PM 15 professional licenses?

16 A Yes.

17 Q Which licenses did you obtain?

18 A I'm a licensed certified public accountant in Illinois. I
19 also hold and am designated a Chartered Financial Analyst.

02:41PM 20 Q When did you obtain those licenses?

21 A The CPA in 2012, and the CFA in 2013.

22 Q Do you continue to hold those licenses today?

23 A Yes.

24 Q Let's briefly discuss your work history now. After
02:41PM 25 graduating, where did you work?

1 A I worked for the Financial Accounting Standards Board,
2 which is a rulemaking organization that creates accounting
3 standards.

4 Q What was your title there?

02:42PM 5 A Postgraduate technical assistant.

6 Q And in that role, what type of work did you perform?

7 A I assisted the board and the staff in researching and
8 creating new accounting standards.

9 Q How long did you work there?

02:42PM 10 A One year.

11 Q After that, where did you work?

12 A I worked for KPMG. It's a large public accounting firm.

13 Q What was your title at KPMG?

14 A Senior associate.

02:42PM 15 Q And what kind of work did you do there?

16 A I assisted companies with complex transactions and how to
17 account for them, as well as perform business and intangible
18 asset valuation services.

19 Q How long did you work at KPMG?

02:42PM 20 A Approximately three years.

21 Q After you left KPMG, where did you go?

22 A I worked for Analysis Group.

23 Q And that's where you currently work?

24 A Yes.

02:42PM 25 Q What year was it when you started at Analysis Group?

1 A 2011.

2 Q And in the past ten years, have you held other titles
3 besides senior vice president or vice president?

4 A Yes.

02:43PM 5 Q And what other titles -- well, let me ask, how, if at
6 all, have your job responsibilities changed in the past ten
7 years?

8 A My job responsibilities have evolved from conducting one
9 aspect of one analysis to overseeing the entirety of many
02:43PM 10 analyses.

11 Q Sorry about that.

12 Has your job at Analysis Group always involved
13 conducting financial analysis?

14 A Yes.

02:43PM 15 Q Over the past ten years, what types of matters have you
16 performed financial analysis on?

17 A I perform financial analyses in bankruptcy disputes,
18 commercial disputes, contract disputes, regulatory matters,
19 shareholder litigations.

02:44PM 20 Q Now, were you and your company, Analysis Group, hired by
21 the Government to conduct financial analysis as part of the
22 Government's case against the defendant, Michael Avenatti?

23 A Yes.

24 Q And has the -- has Analysis Group been paid approximately
02:44PM 25 \$640,000 by the Government?

1 A Yes. We've been approved for approximately 640,000.

2 Q Does that payment include work that Analysis Group has
3 done on other matters as well as this one?

4 A Yes.

02:44PM 5 Q As part of your work for the Government, were you asked
6 to analyze financial records related to the defendant's
7 handling of funds concerning various clients of his?

8 A Yes.

9 Q Was one of these clients Geoffrey Johnson?

02:44PM 10 A Yes.

11 Q Was another Alexis Gardner?

12 A Yes.

13 Q Gregory Barela?

14 A Yes.

02:44PM 15 Q And Michelle Phan and Long Tran?

16 A Yes.

17 Q What kinds of records did you review in conducting your
18 analysis with respect to these clients?

19 A I reviewed bank records, QuickBooks data, settlement
02:45PM 20 agreements primarily.

21 Q When you say "QuickBooks data," what is that?

22 A QuickBooks is a software used by firms to record
23 accounting transactions.

24 Q And you said you reviewed settlement agreements as well?

02:45PM 25 A Yes.

1 Q Did you also review fee agreements with the defendant?

2 A Yes.

3 Q And the materials you reviewed, who provided those to
4 you?

02:45PM 5 A The government.

6 Q Now, the records you reviewed, were they voluminous in
7 nature?

8 A They were.

9 Q How many pages would you say the bank records spanned,
02:45PM 10 approximately?

11 A Many thousands of pages.

12 Q As part of your review of these bank records, did you
13 also review spreadsheets produced by the bank reflecting wire
14 transfers?

02:46PM 15 A I did.

16 Q And how many rows would you say those spreadsheets
17 contained?

18 A Again, thousands.

19 Q Did it take a significant amount of time to review these
02:46PM 20 records?

21 MR. AVENATTI: Objection. Leading.

22 THE COURT: Overruled.

23 THE WITNESS: Yes, it took a significant amount of
24 time.

02:46PM 25 Q BY MR. WYMAN: Based on your review of these voluminous

Exhibit C

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA - SOUTHERN DIVISION
3 HONORABLE JAMES V. SELNA, U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE
4

5 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)
6 Plaintiff,) **CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT**
7 vs.) Case No.
8 MICHAEL JOHN AVENATTI,) SACR-19-00061-JVS
9 Defendant.) **TRIAL DAY 20**
10) **VOLUME 2**
11)
12)
13)
14)
15)
16)
17)
18)
19)
20)
21)
22)
23)
24)
25)

REPORTER'S PARTIAL TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

FRIDAY, AUGUST 13, 2021

1:27 P.M.

SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA

23 **DEBBIE HINO-SPAAN, CSR 7953, CRR**
24 FEDERAL OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
25 411 WEST 4TH STREET, ROOM 1-053
SANTA ANA, CA 92701
dhinospaan@yahoo.com

APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:

FOR THE PLAINTIFF:

NICOLA T. HANNA
United States Attorney
BY: BRETT SAGEL
Assistant United States Attorney
411 West 4th Street
Suite 8000
Santa Ana, California 92701
714-338-3598
brett.sagel@usdoj.gov

NICOLA T. HANNA
United States Attorney
BY: ALEXANDER WYMAN
Assistant United States Attorney
312 North Spring Street
Suite 1100
Los Angeles, California 90012
213-894-2435
alex.wyman@usdoj.gov

FOR THE DEFENDANT IN PRO SE:

MICHAEL JOHN AVENATTI, ESQ.

STANDBY COUNSEL FOR MR. AVENATTI:

H. DEAN STEWARD LAW OFFICES
BY: H. DEAN STEWARD, ESQ.
17 Corporate Plaza
Suite 254
Newport Beach, California 92660
949-481-4900
deansteward7777@gmail.com

I N D E X**WITNESSES****PAGE****JOHN DRUM, CALLED BY THE GOVERNMENT**

Cross-Examination by Mr. Avenatti (resumed)	7
Redirect-Examination by Mr. Wyman	68
Recross-Examination by Mr. Avenatti	77

In-camera hearing transcribed in a separate volume	87
--	----

EXHIBITS

(None offered.)

1 **SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA; FRIDAY, AUGUST 13, 2021**

2 **1:27 P.M.**

3 - - -

4
01:27PM 5 **(Out of the presence of the jury.)**

6 MR. AVENATTI: I have an issue to raise before he
7 takes the stand, please.

8 THE COURT: Mr. Avenatti.

9 MR. AVENATTI: Yes, Your Honor. Following up on
01:27PM 10 what I raised before the break, I'm entitled to these e-mails
11 and these statements from Mr. Drum. I was entitled to them
12 before I started my cross-examination. I'd like them produced
13 immediately, and I would like an adjournment so that I can
14 review them before I continue my cross-examination of Mr. Drum.

01:27PM 15 During the break we had occasion to look for any
16 case law that provides that an expert called by the Government,
17 that somehow that exempts the Government from complying with
18 26.2 and *Jencks*. We can find no such case and no such statute.

19 I also -- and I'll represent I placed calls to three
01:28PM 20 attorneys with a collective of about 100 years criminal law
21 experience who never heard such a thing.

22 There's no question that the materials exist. The
23 witness's testimony could not be more clear. And none of the
24 information was produced, Your Honor. I was entitled to that
01:28PM 25 information before I began my cross-examination so I could

1 tailor my cross-examination accordingly.

2 THE COURT: No, sir. You were entitled to it by
3 statute after he finishes his direct.

4 MR. AVENATTI: Yes. If I misspoke, I apologize,
01:28PM 5 Your Honor. I thought I said before I started my
6 cross-examination.

7 THE COURT: All right.

8 Mr. Wyman.

9 MR. WYMAN: Your Honor, over the lunch break we
01:28PM 10 looked for any e-mails of substance relating to his testimony
11 for Mr. Drum.

12 And, again, I haven't had a chance research the
13 issue. My understanding with an expert is that substantive
14 work product like the exchange of drafts, for example, falls
01:28PM 15 within the work product exception. But with regard to
16 substantive e-mails, what we were able to find was virtually
17 nothing, and the stuff that we had found was like -- you know,
18 I was asking for the extent of their payment and the breakdown
19 of what that payment was for, and we had copied and pasted that
01:29PM 20 and put that into a disclosure letter to the defense.

21 We're happy to provide in camera what we were able
22 to find, which was, as I said, virtually nothing that I don't
23 think has already been disclosed. We're happy to provide that
24 in camera to the Court.

01:29PM 25 THE COURT: Why don't you do that. We're not going

Exhibit D



From: Wyman, Alex (USACAC) <Alex.Wyman@usdoj.gov>

Date: Mon, Aug 16, 2021 at 2:21 PM

Subject: Avenatti

To: Dean Steward <deansteward7777@gmail.com>, emma hernandez <workingwithheh@gmail.com>

Cc: Sagel, Brett (USACAC) <Brett.Sagel@usdoj.gov>

Dean and Emma,

Per the Court's order this afternoon, please see attached our in camera filing from this weekend. The Court has directed us to file this under seal, which we will be doing shortly, and provide a copy to defendant.

Thanks,

Alex

Alex Wyman | **Assistant United States Attorney**

Major Frauds Section

United States Attorney's Office | Central District of California

312 N. Spring St. | Los Angeles, California 90012

T: 213.894.2435 | Alex.Wyman@usdoj.gov

Exhibit E

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SOUTHERN DIVISION

- - -

THE HONORABLE JAMES V. SELNA, JUDGE PRESIDING

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT
Plaintiff,)	
vs.)	
)	SACR-19-00061-JVS
MICHAEL JOHN AVENATTI,)	
Defendant.)	TRIAL DAY 26
-----)	

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Santa Ana, California

August 24, 2021

SHARON A. SEFFENS, RPR
United States Courthouse
411 West 4th Street, Suite 1-1053
Santa Ana, CA 92701
(714) 543-0870

SHARON A. SEFFENS, U.S. DISTRICT COURT REPORTER

1 APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:

2 For the Plaintiff:

3 NICOLA T. HANNA
United States Attorney
4 BRANDON D. FOX
Assistant United States Attorney
5 Chief, Criminal Division
ALEXANDER WYMAN
6 Assistant United States Attorney
Major Frauds Section
7 1100 United States Courthouse
312 North Spring Street
8 Los Angeles, CA 90012
(213) 894-6683

9
BRETT A. SAGEL
10 Assistant United States Attorney
Ronald Reagan Federal Building
11 411 West Fourth Street, Suite 8000
Santa Ana, CA 92701
12 (714) 338-3598

13 For the Defendant:

14 MICHAEL JOHN AVENATTI, PRO SE
15 H. DEAN STEWARD, ADVISORY COUNSEL
H. DEAN STEWARD LAW OFFICES
16 107 Avenida Miramar, Suite C
San Clemente, CA 92672
17 (949) 481-4900

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 I also think Tabs data would have been of
2 assistance to the government even with respect to the two
3 other victims, Tran and Phan.

4 MR. AVENATTI: Your Honor, you said "government"
5 the last two times. Was that purposeful, or did you mean to
6 say the "defense"?

7 THE COURT: I meant to say the defense.

8 MR. AVENATTI: I'm sorry to interrupt.

9 THE COURT: Thank you for the correction.

10 **The documents would have been of assistance to the**
11 **defense in questioning the appropriate amount that**
12 **Mr. Avenatti drew down for himself, even though with respect**
13 **to Tran and Phan, no costs were relevant because their fee**
14 **contracts simply provided for a straight net percentage out**
15 **of the amounts recovered.**

16 I believe that the data would have been useful in
17 an overall showing that the government's accounting records,
18 the methods of Mr. Drum in particular, weren't accurate. He
19 wasn't accurate in part of his analysis. I think the jury
20 could question the accuracy of his methods and results with
21 respect to other clients.

22 It is no answer that the government is not
23 required to prove the exact amount that Mr. Avenatti
24 misappropriated. The government put forth a number, and I
25 believe the defendant was entitled to challenge that number

09:59 1 and to show that it was not accurate. It may have shown
09:59 2 that the amount was appropriated was lesser or greater, or
10:00 3 it would have put a question mark there, and I think the
10:00 4 defendant was entitled to have the ability to put that
10:00 5 question mark there.

10:00 6 I think the testimony -- the factual presentations
10:00 7 this morning indicate to me that out of the identified Tabs
10:00 8 material it would likely have been relevant material to
10:00 9 assist the defense in its cross-examination.

10:00 10 Mr. Fitzgerald indicated to me that if the
10:00 11 additional materials for Tabs and QuickBooks were identified
10:00 12 as part of the initial process of screening the search
10:00 13 warrant materials, he would have reviewed these materials,
10:00 14 and if anything were relevant, he would have passed them on
10:00 15 to the Prosecution Team. We'll never know the answer to
10:00 16 that question because it didn't occur. It seems to me given
10:00 17 the volume of Tabs and the representations I have received
10:00 18 from the defense this morning that there would have been at
10:01 19 least some data passed on.

10:01 20 The question then is is there a violation of
10:01 21 Brady? I focus on Brady because I think the analysis of
10:01 22 Brady is sufficient, even though there may be other grounds
10:01 23 which would call for the government's production of
10:01 24 materials from the Tabs data at least be identified.

10:01 25 Brady versus Maryland, 373 U.S. 83-87 (1963),

1 requires production of materials that are advantageous to
2 the defendant or that tend to call into doubt -- call the
3 government's case into doubt.

4 Brady establishes three requirements: One, the
5 evidence at issue must be favorable to the accused. I find
6 that the Tabs and other accounting data that was not
7 produced would have been favorable to the defendant.

8 Two, the evidence must have been suppressed by the
9 government willfully or inadvertently. I find that it was,
10 quote, "suppressed," although I don't think that's the
11 appropriate word in the context. But it wasn't produced
12 through inadvertence and a failure to appreciate what was
13 there.

14 I find no willful conduct on the part of the
15 Prosecution Team. I find no willful conduct on the part of
16 the Privilege Review Team. I think the Taint Team has
17 fairly acknowledged that there may have been some
18 shortcomings in the review process.

19 Finally, there must be a finding that prejudice
20 must have ensued. I find that prejudice occurred here in a
21 number of ways. I think the defendant was denied an
22 opportunity to craft his overall theory of the case and
23 presentation, including the opening statement, by not having
24 this additional material. I believe that the defense was
25 prejudiced in its ability to cross-examine certain

1 witnesses, in particular, Mr. Drum.

2 At page 5 of his most recent report at Docket 775,
3 Mr. Avenatti outlines a number of things that he could have
4 done had he had the Tabs information, including
5 cross-examination of certain witnesses, ability to question
6 the government's preparation techniques generally, and so
7 on. I won't repeat those.

8 The question is what remedy should I adopt? I do
9 not believe that an adjournment is an appropriate remedy.
10 First of all, an adjournment would not solve the problem
11 that Mr. Avenatti didn't have this material at the front end
12 to craft his theory of the case, his opening statement, and
13 examining of the witnesses. He might have done something
14 different, or he might not have done something different if
15 he had this data. The point is he didn't have the
16 opportunity to make that choice.

17 I believe that any adjournment wouldn't be a
18 short-lived affair but would require a significant amount of
19 time (a) to complete the production to the defendant of the
20 newly described materials and then allow the defendant
21 adequate time to assimilate and craft a strategy based on
22 the newly produced material. I am not prepared to say that
23 that would be a short-lived effort. Given the volume of new
24 material, it seems unlikely that effort would be
25 short-lived.

1 The representation to the jury was our best
2 estimate the case would be concluded by August 20.
3 Obviously, we are past that date, and the defense is still
4 on the defense's case-in-chief. I do not believe it would
5 be appropriate to hold the jury for an extended period of
6 time to allow the defense adequate time to assimilate and
7 prepare in light of the newly produced material.

8 I want to go back and emphasize two points. I
9 repeat my findings that I find no misconduct on the part of
10 the Prosecution Team and no misconduct on the part of the
11 Taint Team. Shortcomings there may have been, but I find no
12 misconduct, intentional or otherwise, on the part of the
13 Taint Team in carrying out its activity.

14 For all those reasons, I grant a new trial. The
15 matter will proceed to trial on October 12, 2021, at 8:30
16 a.m. That's the current date that we ought to have in place
17 our severed portion of the case. I set a status conference
18 for September 27, 2021, at 9:00 a.m. I set a further
19 interim status conference for September 2 at 8:30 a.m. to
20 discuss the overall timing of the case.

21 In terms of a retrial, you should be aware that I
22 will be away from October 17th to October 24th. If we
23 proceed on October 12th on the victim counts, we could
24 impanel a jury I believe the week before I leave and then
25 start the trial probably the week I come back. I want to

1 give the parties an opportunity to assimilate the schedule
2 that I have put out there and come back to me with their
3 thoughts. That's what we will do on September 2.

4 All pending motions are denied or moot at this
5 time.

6 **Anything further?**

7 MR. AVENATTI: Your Honor, from the defense, I
8 believe that the Motion for Mistrial should be with
9 prejudice. I have heard Your Honor's directives this
10 morning, but I would like to have an opportunity to at least
11 submit briefing for consideration by the Court on that point
12 once I have had a chance to look at some of the data. So
13 what I would like to do is collect my thoughts and then
14 propose a briefing schedule to the government and to the
15 Court.

16 THE COURT: That's fine. I think we would like to
17 resolve that issue. The strong presumption is that when a
18 mistrial is granted at the request of the defendant, the
19 grant of a new trial is proper. But I will afford you an
20 opportunity to move for whatever relief you want. I don't
21 think we should do it on an expedited basis, but we
22 shouldn't drag it out either.

23 MR. AVENATTI: I agree, Your Honor. I'm going to
24 need some time to look at the data, but I agree that it's
25 going to have to be dealt with on a measured approach.

10:09 1 THE COURT: Anything further from the government?

10:09 2 MR. SAGEL: No, Your Honor.

10:09 3 THE COURT: Okay, we will be adjourned. Thank
10:09 4 you.

10:09 5 MR. AVENATTI: Your Honor, are you bringing the
10:09 6 jurors in? Are they here?

10:09 7 THE COURT: No, they're not here. I plan to send
10:09 8 them the usual certificate for service, and I plan to send
10:09 9 each one a personal letter indicating that I concluded the
10:09 10 trial and thanking them for their service.

10:09 11 MR. AVENATTI: Understood.

10:09 12 THE COURT: I'm not going to get into the merits
10:09 13 of anything. They put in a significant amount of time, and
10:09 14 I watched these folks. By and large, they were on time
10:09 15 every day. They were diligent. They were watching what was
10:09 16 going on. I think that the parties' efforts to help the
10:09 17 Court in seating a fair and impartial jury were achieved.
10:09 18 They were diligent, and they should be told that.

10:10 19 Thank you.

10:10 20 **(Whereupon, the proceedings were concluded.)**

10:10 21 * * *

10:10 22

10:10 23

10:10 24

10:10 25

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that pursuant to Section 753,
Title 28, United States Code, the foregoing is a true and
correct transcript of the stenographically reported
proceedings held in the above-entitled matter and that the
transcript page format is in conformance with the
regulations of the Judicial Conference of the United States.

Date: August 25, 2021

/s/ Sharon A. Seffens 8/25/21

SHARON A. SEFFENS, U.S. COURT REPORTER

SHARON A. SEFFENS, U.S. DISTRICT COURT REPORTER

Exhibit F

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SOUTHERN DIVISION

- - -

THE HONORABLE JAMES V. SELNA, JUDGE PRESIDING

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT
Plaintiff,)
vs.)
MICHAEL JOHN AVENATTI,) SACR-19-00061-JVS
Defendant.)
-----)

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Santa Ana, California

October 15, 2021

SHARON A. SEFFENS, RPR
United States Courthouse
411 West 4th Street, Suite 1-1053
Santa Ana, CA 92701
(714) 543-0870

SHARON A. SEFFENS, U.S. DISTRICT COURT REPORTER

1 APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:

2 For the Plaintiff:

3 NICOLA T. HANNA
United States Attorney
4 BRANDON D. FOX
Assistant United States Attorney
5 Chief, Criminal Division
ALEXANDER WYMAN
6 Assistant United States Attorney
Major Frauds Section
7 1100 United States Courthouse
312 North Spring Street
8 Los Angeles, CA 90012
(213) 894-6683

9
BRETT A. SAGEL
10 Assistant United States Attorney
Ronald Reagan Federal Building
11 411 West Fourth Street, Suite 8000
Santa Ana, CA 92701
12 (714) 338-3598

13 For the Defendant:

14 MICHAEL JOHN AVENATTI, PRO SE
15 H. DEAN STEWARD, ADVISORY COUNSEL
H. DEAN STEWARD LAW OFFICES
16 107 Avenida Miramar, Suite C
San Clemente, CA 92672
17 (949) 481-4900

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA; FRIDAY, OCTOBER 15, 2021; 9:01 A.M.

2 THE CLERK: Calling Item No. 3, SACR-19-00061-JVS,
3 United States of America versus Michael John Avenatti.

4 Appearances on behalf of the government, please.

5 MR. SAGEL: Good morning, Your Honor. Brett Sagel
6 on behalf of the United States, and on the phone is AUSA
7 Alex Wyman.

8 THE COURT: Good morning.

9 THE CLERK: Appearance on behalf of the defendant,
10 please.

11 MR. AVENATTI: Good morning, Your Honor.
12 defendant Michael Avenatti present by telephone, along with
13 Ms. Cummings-Cefali, and my understanding is that Advisory
14 Counsel, Mr. Dean Steward, is there in the courtroom.

15 THE COURT: Good morning.

16 MR. STEWARD: I'm here, Your Honor. Dean Steward,
17 Advisory Counsel, for Mr. Avenatti.

18 THE COURT: Good morning.

19 I received the parties' briefs with respect to the
20 issue of the Court's continuing jurisdiction in light of the
21 Notice of Appeal that Mr. Avenatti has filed.

22 I also note that the government has brought in the
23 Ninth Circuit a Motion for Dismissal of Summary Affirmance.
24 It appears there is going to be a fairly quick briefing
25 schedule on that motion.

1 As far as my role as district judge, I find that I
2 have been diversified of jurisdiction by virtue of the Notice
3 of Appeal. Double jeopardy is a unique issue that makes it
4 appropriate for an interlocutory appeal, and it's fairly
5 clear in the case law and not really contested. The only
6 exception to that is if the District Court determines that
7 the appeal is frivolous.

8 I do not make such a finding as part of entering
9 my ruling on the double jeopardy motion, and I'm unable to
10 make such a finding now. I found a Brady violation with
11 respect to a very important range of documents relating to
12 the financial affairs of Mr. Avenatti's firm. I think that
13 conclusion alone would indicate that the appeal is not
14 frivolous.

15 Mr. Avenatti raises a number of other issues
16 besides the financial data relative to his argument that the
17 Court should not exercise its discretion to conduct a new
18 trial.

19 I think there is also a substantial question as to
20 with what the term "goading" means. I found that the
21 government did not take any action to provoke the defendant
22 into seeking a mistrial. Other courts have interpreted the
23 term "goading" more extensively such that an intent to
24 provoke a Motion for Mistrial is not required to establish
25 "goading."

1 Accordingly, given the Brady violation that the
2 Court found and the somewhat undeterminate definition of the
3 term "goadings," I find that the appeal is not frivolous.
4 For that reason, the Court vacates the November 2 trial
5 date. The Court also vacates all pending motions to be
6 renoticed once jurisdiction is restored to this Court if
7 jurisdiction is restored to this Court.

8 I believe that I still have jurisdiction to
9 consider nonsubstantive matters that do not affect in any
10 way the Notice of Appeal and the issues raised by
11 Mr. Avenatti on appeal. Among those ministerial matters is
12 continued document production.

13 I had asked for a report yesterday, Thursday, the
14 14th, by noon with respect to what TABS or QuickBooks
15 material with respect to the four or five individual clients
16 appeared in the production and subsequent to August 23. I
17 received a day early -- maybe it was on time. I received a
18 response from Mr. Avenatti filed in-camera. I also received
19 an application from the government to continue the date for
20 its response.

21 I grant the government a continuance of 30 days to
22 prepare its response. I'm prepared to address the rest of
23 the government's ex parte application with regard to its
24 Rule 17 subpoena.

25 First, I will ask is there any objection on